



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 February 2025

by H Whitfield BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/24/3358177

264 Darnall Road, Sheffield S9 5AN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Mohammed Naseem Shahid against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02820/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as "Property has 2No. front dormers (subject to planning enforcement). Application is to retain one of the dormers and remove the second dormer and replace it with a Velux window."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application form states the development was started in January 2020 but has not been completed. Two front dormers were in place on the appeal property at the time of my site visit. The appeal proposal seeks permission to retain the left-hand dormer and replace the other with a rooflight. For clarity, I have dealt with the appeal based on the submitted plans.
3. I note that there have been other appeals on this site that have considered, amongst other matters, dormer windows on the front of the appeal building. Whilst these decisions are material considerations, I have determined this appeal on its own merits.
4. A revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 12 December 2024 and corrected on 7 February 2025. I have had regard to the Framework as a material consideration in my decision making. As there are no substantive changes relevant to the appeal before me, I have not invited further comments from the parties on this matter. I am satisfied that neither party is prejudiced by this.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the appeal building and surrounding area.

Reasons

6. The appeal building is a detached dwelling located in a predominately residential area containing a variety of closely positioned properties, many of which have been altered over time. The topography of the land increases along Darnall Road and the houses respond to the change in land level. This results in the appeal building being sited on slightly higher ground than its immediate neighbour. The positioning of

properties at different levels affords views of the predominately pitched roofs in the area. The simple roof forms, as well as the generally consistent building lines provides for a cohesive character.

7. The appeal proposal would result in the retention of the left-hand front dormer window and replacement of the other with a rooflight. The dormer window is set within the roof slope; however, it is a large, prominent structure of considerable height and depth that dominates the front roof. Whilst materials have been used to assimilate with the host property, the large size of the dormer results in a top-heavy appearance that unbalances the principal elevation. This is exacerbated by the dormer, and the window within it, being out of alignment with the existing windows below and would be compounded by the removal of the right-hand dormer in place of a rooflight which would further unbalance the front elevation.
8. The appellant has referred to other dormers in the wider area, including those that the Council has recently approved. I have not been provided with the details of these cases and am therefore unable to draw any direct comparisons with the scheme before me. However, from my site visit I saw that there were no dormers on nearby properties on this section of Darnall Road and those found on Barnardiston Road are viewed in a different context to the appeal property. Moreover, each case must be dealt with on its own merits.
9. During my site visit I observed other examples of rooflights within front-facing roof slopes along Darnall Road. Whilst the proposed rooflight would be out of alignment with the window below, this in isolation would not be uncharacteristic of other properties in the area. Furthermore, I note the Council finds no harm with the proposed rooflight and I find no reason to take a different view on this matter.
10. Nevertheless, the retention of the dormer would result in an unbalancing and incongruous development that would fail to relate well to the appeal building. The resultant development would be an alien and overly prominent feature in the street scene, and this would be exacerbated by the site's elevated position. This is contrary to Guidelines 1 and 2 of the Council's Designing House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance which encourages extensions that are comparable with the character and built form of the area and do not detract from the dwelling or appearance of the street.
11. I therefore conclude that the appeal development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the appeal building and surrounding area. Consequently, it would conflict with Policies BE5 and H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998) and Policy CS74 of the Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy (2009), which seek, amongst other matters, for developments to be well designed, including in terms of scale, character, form and detailing.

Other Matters

12. Reference has been made to the site's planning history, and I note the appellant's concerns over the Council's handling of the application. However, this appeal follows the Council's formal decision, and I have determined the case on its own planning merits.
13. The appellant also refers to the lack of objections from interested parties on the application and the development resulting in no adverse impacts on living

conditions, the landscape or highway safety. However, these matters are neutral factors and do not alter my findings on this appeal.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

H Whitfield

INSPECTOR